

Karolina Mroziejewicz

Warsaw

‘WHEN THE TURK ROAMED AROUND BELGRADE’: THE OTTOMANS’
ADVENT TO THE HUNGARIAN BORDERLANDS IN THE PRE-MOHÁCS
FLUGSCHRIFTEN

Introduction

Pitocles of Samos once related that Pericles, the famous Athenian orator, had such a great gift of eloquence and such a power of arousing emotions that – as related in the ancient comedies – it was believed that he did not talk nor have a voice, but rather caused lightning and thunder. He exercised this special gift not only to create a sense of awe about what he had to say, but he also practised it each time new obligations caused him to voice his concerns in public. This great orator, who by the brilliance of speech penetrated peoples’ minds, bid them to fear the consequences of his oration.¹

This erudite episode, told in elegant, humanistic Latin, opens an oration by Francesco Chiericati (1480-1539)², who sought to produce a similar effect on the delegates present at the Diet of Nuremberg on 19 November 1522. The thunderous tone of Chiericati’s oration, given at the Diet shortly after the fall of Belgrade (1521) and fall of Rhodes (1522), was characteristic for the spokesman of Pope Hadrian VI (1522-1523) and, at the same time, of Hungarian king Louis II (1516-1526), whose kingdom was believed to be the next target of the Ottoman army. Chiericati’s speech, warning about the approach of the ‘the Turk’³ and Luther’s schism, was disseminated in the form of a brochure in at least four

¹ Francesco Chiericati, *Oratio habita Nurimbergae in senatu Principum Germaniae.xiii. Cal. Decembris, M.D.XXII*, [Augsburg: Sigmund Grimm and Marx Wirsung, 1522], A3v.

² The years given in parentheses provide the dates for the reigns of popes, emperors, sultans and kings; in all other cases only the date of birth and death of the particular person is provided.

³ ‘The Turk’ (lat. *Turci*, *Turcae*), is a term used in early modern written sources to describe the elites of the Ottoman Empire and its subjects, as well as numerous varied Turkic peoples. In most usages, the term reflects a rather monolithic image of the Ottoman Empire, called *Turcia* or *Turkey*, and its inhabitants. In today’s scholarly literature the use of the term could interfere with drawing a complex image of the Empire, which was an organism encompassing different ethnic, religious and linguistic groups, as well as people of highly varied social status. The early modern authors, however, held the opinion that the Turks were a unified group, sharing the same origins. When referring to this conception, I will therefore use the term ‘the Turk’ and, in drawing the historical background, I will apply the term ‘Ottomans’ (which is how the ruling group of the Empire identified itself) and ‘Ottoman Empire’.

editions and two language versions shortly after it was delivered in Nuremberg.⁴ This 'flying writing' quickly reached the hands of both the most prominent intellectuals – including Erasmus (ca 1466–1536) – and also of the anonymous burghers of the Holy Roman Empire, imprinting on them a particular interpretation and articulation of the Ottoman issue. An attempt to answer the question of how such broad circulation was possible and what the significance of the *Flugschrift* in the information traffic at the time would have been, is the main objective of this paper.

The following study approaches the role of *Flugschriften* within the communication process, and examines the consequences of the production and consumption of these 'flying writings'. It offers a closer look at the processes, their main agents (authors, translators, printers, readers etc.) and the resulting media (such as original texts, translations, prints etc.). What follows is then a literary and historical investigation that attempts to understand who participated in this cultural transfer, but also how and why: who produced images of Ottomans, what were these images about, in which circumstances could they have been constructed, and for what reasons? Who popularized them in the urban centres of the early modern Holy Roman Empire and what purposes did they serve? Which channels of communication did the producers use, and what role did oral sources play in creating an up-to-date vision of the 'enemies of Christendom'? The question of how these *Flugschriften* were produced and used in the 'Turkish debate' will in turn allow for reflections on their reception among different groups of readers.

The selected source-base encompasses three texts widely disseminated by the *Flugschriften* printed around 1522: an oration of Francesco Chiericati, an oration of Ladislaus de Macedonia (ca 1479–1536), and an anonymous fictive dialogue between a Turk, a Gypsy, a German hermit and a Hungarian⁵; all three offer rich sources for the present study. On the one hand, they show the means used to construct the image of 'the Turk' and, on the other, the circumstances in which this cultural representation was voiced (in the Imperial Diets) and manufactured (in the urban centers of the Holy Roman Empire and the Swiss Confederacy). These texts also provide an insight into the civic landscape of the German-speaking territories in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, a period characterised by the outbreak of debates on social and cultural reformations, on the Reformation propagated by Martin Luther (1483–1546), on the 'Turkish threat' and on news about the 'New World'.

Much has already been said in current scholarship about the representations of the Ottomans and of Islam in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. It has been convincingly demonstrated that their imagery was culturally and chronologically specific, and that it depended on a complex net of social, religious and geo-political factors as well as cultural fashions and literary traditions.⁶ It moved between the two poles of open

⁴ For the description of editions and variants see: *Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts*, hrsg. von der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München in Verbindung mit der Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (quoted later as VD 16), I. Bezzel (ed.), 22 vols, Stuttgart 1983–1995, entries: C 2235–2241.

⁵ Francesco Chiericati, *Oratio habita Nurimbergae...*; Ladislaus de Macedonia, *Oratio habita Norimbergae coram Senatu Principum et omnium Ordinum Sacri Ro. Imperii, pro expeditione in Turcos suscipienda*, iii.Ca[1].Decembr. M.D.XXII, [Nuremberg: Friedrich Peypus, 1522], (VD16 M 19–20; VD16 ZV 10219); *Turcken puechlein. Ein Nutzlich Gespräch oder vnderrede etlicher personen zu besserung Christlicher ordenung vnd lebens gedichtet. In die schweren leüff dieser vnser zeyt dienstlich...*, [Basel: Valentin Curio, 1522], (VD16 T 2233–2238, VD16 ZV 28152).

⁶ Among them were such contemporary phenomena as prophetic and eschatological thinking (see for example: U. Adnermann, 'Geschichtsdeutung und Prophetie. Krisenerfahrung und Bewältigung am Beispiel

admiration and fierce hostility, with all possible modalities in between. The rich academic production on this subject includes numerous nuanced and perceptive interpretations of the images of the Ottomans in the Hungarian and German-speaking areas, which demonstrate that the notion of 'the Turk' could be easily multiplied and transformed according to domestic agendas and also, thanks to the print medium, effectively disseminated.⁷ The *Flugschriften* actively contributed to this promulgation.

Dozens of *Flugschriften* concerning the Ottomans were printed in the German-speaking regions during the first quarter of the sixteenth century.⁸ Turning attention towards the 'pamphlet moment' – marked by the peak of their production between 1522 and 1525⁹ – one sees a wide range of social tensions and a network of actors involved in

der osmanischen Expansion im Spätmittelalter und in der Reformationszeit', [in:] B. Guthmüller, W. Kühnmann (eds.), *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, Tübingen 2000, pp. 29–54; Y. Miyamoto, 'The influence of medieval prophecies on views of the Turks. Islam and apocalypticism in the sixteenth century', *Journal of Turkish Studies* 27 (1993), pp. 125–145; crusade ideology (N. Housley, 'A necessary evil? Erasmus, the crusade, and war against the Turks', [in:] J. France, W.G. Zajac (eds.), *The Crusades and their Sources: Essays Presented to Bernard Hamilton*, Aldershot 1998, pp. 259–279), the struggle for 'common reformation and right order' as it was called on the pages of *Türcken puechlein...* (fol. C3v; analysis of this tendency is well presented by: G. Strauss, 'Ideas of *reformatio* and *renovatio* from the Middle Ages to the Reformation', [in:] T.A. Brady, H.A. Oberman, J.D. Tracy (eds.), *Handbook of European History 1400–1600: Late Middle Ages, Renaissance and Reformation*, vol. 2, Leiden, New York and Cologne 1995, pp. 1–30, with comprehensive bibliographical references to the earlier scholarship), theological polemics (M. Brecht, 'Luther und die Türken', [in:] B. Guthmüller, W. Kühnmann (eds.), *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, Tübingen 2000, pp. 9–27; M. Iyigun, 'Luther and Süleyman', *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 123/4 (2008), pp. 1465–1494; J. Kritzl, "Adversus turcas et turcarum deum". *Beurteilungskriterien des Türkenkrieges und des Islam in den Werken Martin Luthers*, Bonn 2008), the background of Habsburg-Ottoman rivalry (See: G. Ágoston, 'Information, ideology, and limits of imperial policy: Ottoman grand strategy in the context of Ottoman-Habsburg rivalry', [in:] V.H. Aksan, D. Goffman (eds.), *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 75–103, esp. 97–98; 100–103; idem, 'Ideologie, Propaganda und politischer Pragmatismus: Die Auseinandersetzung der osmanischen und habsburgischen Grossmächte und die mitteleuropäische Konfrontation', [in:] M. Fuchs, T. Oborni, G. Újvári (eds.), *Kaiser Ferdinand I: Ein mitteleuropäischer Herrscher*, Münster 2005, pp. 207–233; J. Elliott, 'Ottoman-Habsburg rivalry: the European perspective', [in:] H. İnalçık, C. Kafadar (eds.), *Süleymân the Second and his Time*, İstanbul 1993, pp. 165–174), and the reflection of travelers', spies', and captives' knowledge about the Ottomans (see for instance: A. Höfert, *Den Feind Beschreiben. "Türkengefahr" und europäisches Wissen über das Osmanische Reich 1450–1600*, Frankfurt am Main 2004).

⁷ Among more recent English- and German-language works concerning image of the Ottomans in Hungary are: P. Fodor, 'The view of the Turk in Hungary: the apocalyptic tradition and the red apple in Ottoman-Hungarian context', [in:] idem (ed.), *In Quest of the Golden Apple: Imperial Ideology, Politics, and Military Administration in the Ottoman Empire*, İstanbul 2000, pp. 71–103, esp. 76–81, A. Forgó, 'Überlegungen zum Wandel des Osmanenbildes im Königreich Ungarn der Frühen Neuzeit', [in:] G. Haug-Moritz, L. Pelizaeus (eds.), *Repräsentationen der islamischen Welt im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*, Münster 2010, pp. 75–95; J. Jankovics, 'The image of the Turks in Hungarian renaissance literature', [in:] B. Guthmüller, W. Kühnmann (eds.), *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, Tübingen 2000, pp. 268–273. There are numerous studies on the representations of Ottomans in the German-speaking territories, here suffice to mention only the newest ones that touch upon *Flugschriften* such as: S.R. Falkner, 'Perverved spaces: boundary negotiations in early-modern Turcica', [in:] J.R. Hodkinson, J. Morrison (eds.), *Encounters with Islam in German Literature and Culture*, Rochester 2009, pp. 55–72; A. Höfert, 'Alteritätsdiskurse: Analyseparameter historischer Antagonismusnarrative und ihre historiographischen Folgen', [in:] G. Haug-Moritz, L. Pelizaeus (eds.), *Repräsentationen der islamischen Welt im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*, Münster 2010, pp. 21–40; T. Kaufmann, "Türckenbüchlein": zur christlichen Wahrnehmung "türkischer Religion" in Spätmittelalter und Reformation, Göttingen 2008. Each of these contributions contains references to the earlier scholarship.

⁸ Cf. C. Göllner, *Die europäischen Türkendrucke des 16. Jahrhunderts, 1501–1550*, Bucharest 1961, pp. 19–130.

⁹ 'Pamphlet moment' is an expression taken from: A. Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, Cambridge 2005, p. 165; cf. with the graph in J. Schwitalla, *Flugschrift*, Tübingen 1999, p. 55.

the a wide debate concerning the *bonum commune*, ways of achieving prosperity in the whole empire and in civic communities. Among them, brochures reporting on the approach of the Ottoman army toward the Hungarian Kingdom hold an important place. These *Flugschriften*, on the one hand, spread the information that functioned on the highest level of politics, and that involved the Pope, the Habsburgs and the Hungarian king; on the other, they transmitted to German-speaking burghers accounts of the Sultan's army based on reports from inhabitants of the border-zones. They refer to different informers and the sources of information they use, and give a prominent place to the first-hand accounts.

The military encounter between the armies of Süleyman I the Magnificent (1520–1566) and the defenders of Belgrade, *umb Kriechischen Weissenburg*, as the German-language sources report, is echoed in all three texts from the selected source corpus. The siege of the city, quite apart from its military significance, signaled important changes within the cultural and political map of Europe. Belgrade was considered the key to the Hungarian kingdom, and its fall opened a new chapter in Ottoman-Hungarian relations, which concluded with the battle of Mohács (1526) and the establishment of the Ottoman rule in 1541.¹⁰ On the level of intercultural history, this new phase may be characterized by shifts in Ottoman imagery and by the importance of the role of the intermediary. In both, Hungarian witnesses played an important function; as the main participants in the event, its victims and its corroborators, the Hungarians intermediated in the transfer of information about the Ottoman advent both within the German-speaking areas and, more broadly, to the citizens of the international *Respublica litteraria*. This role brought the fifteenth-century concept of 'bulwark of Christendom'¹¹ back to the foreground, and introduced a debate that consolidated a particular type of cultural and political identity which distinguished Hungarian elites from the mid-fifteenth century up to the modern era.

Turkish booklets

The short verse, placed on the title page of the popular fictive dialogue between a Turk, a German hermit, a Gipsy and a Hungarian, printed in 1522, explains the function of the pamphlet:

¹⁰ G. Pálffy, 'The Habsburg defense system in Hungary against the Ottomans in the sixteenth century: a catalyst of military development in Central Europe', [in:] B.L. Davies (ed.), *Warfare in Eastern Europe, 1500–1800*, Leiden 2012, p. 36; F. Szakály, 'Nándorfehérvár 1521. The beginning of the end of the medieval Hungarian kingdom', [in:] G. Dávid, P. Fodor (eds.), *Hungarian-Ottoman Military and Diplomatic Relations in the Age of Suleyman the Magnificent*, Budapest 1994, pp. 47–76.

¹¹ The concept functioned in numerous contact-zones (such as Croatia, Georgia, Serbia, Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) from the early fifteenth century onwards. In the Hungarian Kingdom of the sixteenth-century, the idea was articulated by different names, such as *propugnaculum Christianitatis*, *scutum atque murus Christianae fidei*, *antemurale Christianitatis*, *murus et clipeus fidelium*. For the overview of the problem see: L. Hopp, 'Az "antemurale" és a "conformitas" humanista eszméje a magyar-lengyel hagyományban [The humanist notions of *antemurale* and *conformitas* in the Hungarian-Polish tradition]', Budapest 1992, esp. pp. 44–62; I. Mihály, 'Der ungarische Türkenkrieg als rhetorisches Thema in der Frühen Neuzeit', [in:] W. Kühlmann, A. Schindling (eds.), *Deutschland und Ungarn in ihren Bildungs- und Wissenschaftsbeziehungen während der Renaissance*, Stuttgart 2004, pp. 93–107; J.J. Varga, 'Europa und "Die Vormauer des Christentums". Die Entwicklungsgeschichte eines geflügelten Wortes', [in:] B. Guthmüller, W. Kühlmann (eds.), *Europa und die Türken in der Renaissance*, Tübingen 2000, pp. 55–63.

A Turkish booklet I am called
And desire to be to Christians known,
To make them turn to the better
And thus the Turks repel.¹²

The word *Püchlin*, mentioned in the lines above – or, in the more standard version, *Büchlein* (literally small book or booklet) – was used in sixteenth century to denote what today is called *Flugschrift* (pl. *Flugschriften*), often rendered from German as a brochure, a pamphlet print or, more literally, a 'flying writing'.¹³

Such prints were produced almost exclusively in the quarto format and contained a modest number of pages, generally not exceeding sixty. As the predecessor of the modern booklet, it was used to transmit different types of texts such as orations, letters, fictive dialogues and various dispatches on current political and social matters. Relatively cheap, quick to produce, and easy to disseminate, they functioned – in a manner not dissimilar to today's brochures – as a convenient medium for polemics, agitation and publicity. It is for this reason that the *Flugschrift* has become an especially attractive subject within recent studies on the communication process, transfers of knowledge and public opinion in pre-modern Europe.

Most of the *Flugschriften* were anonymous; however, the level of anonymity can be varied. In the cases of the orations of Ladislaus de Macedonia and Francesco Chiericati, the name and distinction of the author are specified in detail. The author of *Turcken puechlein*, on the other hand, hides himself under the popular and meaningful pseudonym: 'Philalethes', the friend of the truth.¹⁴ The printer's identity, as well as the name and location of the printing press, are not provided in most of the *Flugschriften*. It is estimated that no more than a third of the published pamphlets indicated the printer along with the date and place in which they were printed.¹⁵ This estimate is reflected in the group of three pamphlets under discussion, out of which only the German translation of Ladislaus' oration informs the reader about the printer and place of publication. Whereas the lack of such information gave the printer a chance to avoid the consequences of censorship and copyright law (known at the time as the 'printing privilege', the exclusive right to publish a work for a certain period within a particular territory¹⁶), their inclusion could serve as an advertisement technique.

Production of *Flugschriften* was a lucrative business in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially between 1522–1526, when they became the preferred medium of printed public communication in the German speaking territories. Texts from this period report on theological controversies, on the debate surrounding social issues, as

¹² Das Türcken püchlin bin ich genant / Und beger den Cristen werden bekant / Domit Sy sich zu besserung keren / Und dester das des Tuercken erwerben: *Turcken puechlein*... A1r.

¹³ Cf. J. Schwitalla, *Flugschrift*, pp. 2–7.

¹⁴ This pseudonym was used *inter alia* by such influential contemporary figures as humanists Jakob Sobius (ca 1493–ca 1528), bishop of Vienna Friedrich Nausea (ca 1496–1552) and Dominican adversary of Luther, Jacob van Hoogstraten (1460–1527). Cf. A.F. Balogh, *Eine Unterredung gegen die Türken: zweisprachige kommentierte Edition der deutschen Flugschrift VD 16:T2239*, Budapest 2003, pp. 34–35.

¹⁵ J. Schwitalla, *Flugschrift*, p. 25.

¹⁶ J. Feather, 'Copyright and the creation of literary property', [in:] S. Eliot, J. Rose (eds.), *A Companion to the History of the Book*, Oxford 2007, pp. 522–523.

well as on matters of local and supra-local interests. During these years, as J. Schwitalla observes, *Flugschriften* not only provide a commentary on what was happening, but are also creators of history themselves.¹⁷

It was not so much the *Flugschriften* as a medium, but rather the *Flugschriften* as collaborative projects that shaped the perception of contemporary events. The authors, printers and readers of the disseminated texts determined the selection and reporting of events. Between 1522 and 1526, all three groups were eager to pick up accounts on the Ottomans' progress in the Balkans and the approach of their army toward German-speaking areas.

Accounts on the Ottoman-European encounters before Mohács

Information concerning the Ottomans became especially sought after as the Ottoman troops drew closer to the Hungarian borders and became a potential danger for the Habsburg domains; during this time, all possible channels of communication such as printed ballads, laments, pamphlets, military reports, official letters, and apocryphal writings came into use. At this time, the information traffic from the Hungarian contact-zones also began to increase. Louis II and archduke of Austria Ferdinand I (1521–1564, Holy Roman Emperor 1558–1564) sent official letters to Charles V pleading for military and financial help to overcome the 'Turkish threat'. Hungarian delegates crossed their kingdom and went also to German Diets, supported by the papal nuncios, in order to warn the Habsburgian rulers about the scale of the danger; all of this activity is reflected in the printed pages of *Flugschriften* around 1522–1526.

Yet, there are numerous earlier signals of anxiety about 'the Turks', the earliest of which is perhaps the alleged letter of Byzantine Emperor Alexios I Komnenos (1081–1118) to Robert II, count of Flanders (ca 1065–1111) dated to 1088.¹⁸ The unprecedented intensification of accounts regarding the 'Turkish threat', however, was a reaction to the fall of Constantinople to the forces of Mehmed II (1444–1446, 1451–1481), which had already been recorded in the first fully preserved European print known as the Turkish Calendar of 1454, attributed to the group of Gutenberg's prints.¹⁹ The actions of his successors – Bayezid II (1447–1512) and Selim I (1470–1520) were also noticed in the *Flugschriften*.²⁰ However, it was the military achievements of Süleyman I the Magnificent (1520–1566) in Europe – whom shortly after his succession, as we learn from the letter by the papal secretary to King Sigismund I of Poland (1506–1548), 'many used to regard

¹⁷ J. Schwitalla, *Flugschrift*, p. 1.

¹⁸ 'The Supposed Letter from Alexius Comnenus to Robert, Count of Flanders', [in:] Robert of Reims, *Robert the Monk's History of the First Crusade: Historia Iherosolimitana*, transl. C. Sweetenham, Aldershot 2005, pp. 215–222.

¹⁹ See: *Der Türkenkalender: "Eyn manung der Cristenheit widder die Durken"*; Mainz 1454; das älteste vollständig erhaltene gedruckte Buch, Rar. 1 der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, with commentary by F. Geldner, Wiesbaden 1975; E. Simon, *The Türkenkalender (1454) attributed to Gutenberg and the Strasbourg Lunation Tracts*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1988.

²⁰ To mention only the printed version of Bayezid's letter: *Das ist die abgeschrieben von dem brief den der Türkisch Keyser dem kunig von Franckreich geschickt hat von wegen hertzen von Mailand den er wider wil haben eingesetzt in sein furstenthumb Mailand oder er wil dem kunig vom Franckreich mit heres krafft in sein land ziehen*, [Nuremberg: Hieronymus Hölzel, 1501]; and reflection of Selim's conflict with the Shah of Persia: *Der krieg zwischenn dem großmechtigen propheten Sophi T[ue]rcken vnd dem Soldan alle die ding die do geschehen seind in auffgang der Sonnen [et]c.* Hat kundt gethan ein Christen Kauffman wonend zu Alexandria vnserm aller heyligisten vater dem Babst Im Jar M.CCCCC.vnd.Xvii printed at least in three editions in 1518.

as unwarlike and peace-loving'²¹ – that were reflected most strongly in printed brochures from the first quarter of the sixteenth century.

Süleyman's political line – against the expectations of the papal Curia – followed the court party seeking for conquests in Europe, of which the successful siege of Belgrade (1521) was a spectacular beginning. The fall of this bulwark, the last major fortress guarding the way to Hungary, followed by the fall of several other strongholds between 1523 and 1525, left the Hungarian Kingdom unprotected.²²

At the same time, the successful siege of the island of Rhodes (1522) opened the eastern Mediterranean basin for Süleyman's campaigns. The Sultan's victories over Belgrade and Rhodes, two Christian strongholds, were deeply imprinted in the imagination of the populace, and soon were mentioned together in one line in the contemporary sources. Almost four years later, the battle at Mohács was added to the list of miserable defeats of Christendom. The defeat of the Hungarian army and death of Louis II shook the European monarchs and their subjects, and strengthened the negative image of Ottomans as reflected in the *Flugschriften*. The battle at Mohács opened a new chapter in the perception and representation of Ottomans in the German-speaking territories; however, as it was motivated by different political factors, it is a part of a different story.²³

The battle of Mohács was preceded by a series of diplomatic missions and official meetings intensified by the fall of Belgrade and by a growing awareness of the Ottomans' plans concerning the conquest of Hungary. Hungarian legates presented their pleas for support in Venice, at the Vatican, at the Imperial Diet in Worms (1521), the second Diet in Nuremberg (1522–1523), and the Diet in Speyer (1526). Apart from financial help from Hadrian VI and much belated military help from the Holy Roman Empire acquired after the Diet in Speyer, they met with little success.

Diets in Nuremberg were convened to discuss the legal and institutional reform of the Empire, to address the Lutheran issue and to establish monopolies and taxation for the war against the Ottomans. The last two matters were of the highest interest for the Vatican legate Francesco Chiericati,²⁴ and the last one was also of great importance for the embassy of Louis II, which involved Ladislaus de Macedonia.²⁵

Orations of Ladislaus de Macedonia and Francesco Chiericati

'Until nowadays, Hungary has been a shield and a wall for Germany'²⁶, says a passage from the speech by Ladislaus de Macedonia who, as a legate elected by the Hungarian Diet to deliver on 19 November 1522 an oration pleading for military and financial

²¹ K.M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204–1571*, Philadelphia 1976, vol. 3, p. 198.

²² P. Engel, *Realm of St Stephen: A History of Medieval Hungary, 895–1526*, London 2001, pp. 367–368. The immediate aftermath of the siege of Belgrade is also mentioned in: Francesco Chiericati, *Oratio habita Norimbergae...* and Ladislaus de Macedonia, *Oratio habita Norimbergae...*

²³ Cf. C. Göllner, 'Betrachtungen zur öffentlichen Meinung über die Schlacht von Mohács (1526)', *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* 6/1 (1967), pp. 67–76.

²⁴ See: A. Wrede (ed.), *Deutsche Reichstagsakten unter Kaiser Karl V*, Gotha 1901, vol. 3, pp. 383–452. The acts of the proceedings show the ways in which perception of Luther's teaching depended on the context of the Ottoman advances in Europe.

²⁵ Ibidem, pp. 319–383.

²⁶ In Latin version: *Qualis clipeus, qualis murus fuerit hactenus Hungaria Germaniae*: Ladislaus de Macedonia, *Oratio habita Norimbergae...*, B4r.

help against the Ottoman army, tried to show it as a common task for the whole of Christendom. The printed version of his speech was dedicated to Palatine of Hungary István Báthory (died 1530) and János Zápolyai (1487–1540) and was published both in Latin and in a German translation most probably in the same year.

Ladislaus was a Hungarian humanist and the bishop of Várad. He was born perhaps in the village of Perjámos, to the noble family *de Macedonia* (from the name of the villages belonging to the family) residing in the Temes region.²⁷ Not much is known about his studies or the early stages of his career; he most probably attended the university in Vienna, as was a habit of Hungarian young noblemen at the time, and then received promotion to archdeacon of Baranya and canonic of Pécs.²⁸ In Pécs, Ladislaus became a part of the humanistic retinue of György Szatmári (ca 1457–1524), in whose circle he was able to tighten his connections with his relative István Báthory. The Palatine increased the speed of Ladislaus' political career. He sent him to Poland in 1520 to mediate in the marriage negotiations with the family of Mazovian princess Zofia (ca 1497–1543) and afterwards recommended Ladislaus to the Hungarian king Louis II. In the 1520s Ladislaus was at the peak of his career, having been appointed bishop of Szerém.

Ladislaus' intellectual background and his personal network is reflected in the oration. In the opening sentences of the dedication, following the humanistic habit, the author writes that it was not his own initiative to have the speech printed, but that of his colleagues and fellows from the delegation: Steward of the Royal Household Péter Korlátkövi (ca 1480–1526), influential jurist and politician István Werbőczy (ca 1465–1541), János Gethei, Zsigmond Pogány and Mihály Kenderesi, who forced him to do so.²⁹ Then, he turns to Báthory and Zápolya and praises their merits and virtues in the fights against the Ottomans both for the benefits of the whole Christendom and for the sake of the Hungarian kingdom.

From the beginning of his oration, when calling for military help for the endangered kingdom, Ladislaus mixes an appeal for the common crusade with calls for the defence of Hungary. By referring to the idea of a crusade, he also alludes to the ambitions of the Habsburg Emperor to be seen as head of all Christendom. In this context, Ladislaus presents Hungary, on the one hand, as a bulwark of Christendom which for a hundred and fifty years has guarded and defended the entire Christian community and, on the other, as a faithful ally of Charles' V domains: 'We are Christians, allies and friends of the Holy Roman Empire'.³⁰ Although Ladislaus' oration is heavy from the thick layer of anti-Turkish propaganda, in a fashion characteristic of the Hungarian court, it is also rich in information about the progress of Ottoman military campaigns in Asia and Europe.

Several passages from Ladislaus' oration resemble a military report providing details from the war zone, and Ladislaus presents the Ottoman intrusions into Hungary as the Sultan's preparation for invading the Habsburg lands. The orator gives the following information: after the fall of Belgrade, the Ottoman army entered the Hungarian territories. It crossed the Danube and Sava, which posed a great risk of further

²⁷ I.K. Horvath, K.E. Obermayer, *De Vita operibusque Ladislai de Macedonia*, Szeged 1958, p. 11.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 12.

²⁹ Ladislaus de Macedonia, *Oratio habita Norimbergae...*, A3v. Apart from them, also János Gosztonyi, bishop of Győr and János Drágffy, were among the members of the Hungarian delegation: *Deutsche Reichstagsakten...*, p. 323, note 1.

³⁰ Christani quippe sumus, socii et amici huius Sacri Romani imperii: Ladislaus de Macedonia, *Oratio habita Norimbergae...*, B2v.

penetration of the Sultan's soldiers into the Habsburg Empire. If they also took the Tisza and Drava rivers, there would be no other navigable river left until the Rhine, and the enemy would be able to access the German borders. The situation – continues Ladislaus – was not better on the other frontiers of Christendom. The Ottoman army held Lesser Armenia and Lesser Asia from the Euphrates to the Hellespont and Marmara seacoast; it occupied the whole of Greece with Epirus, Macedonia, Thesalia and Thracia, as well as Dalmatia and Illiria.³¹

These strategic considerations add an informative value to Ladislaus' oration which may have been intended to resemble a trustworthy report about the Ottoman progress in Hungary. Ladislaus fashions himself as a reliable and first-hand witness of the Hungarian-Ottoman encounter. The picture that he draws, as he says, is what he truly knows.³² Similarly, the oration by Francesco Chiericati, also delivered on 19 November, contributed to the transmission of information on the campaigns of the Sultan's army. Chiericati however, does not position himself as an eye-witness to the Ottoman advance toward Europe, pointing instead to his Hungarian sources.

These sources are the letters as well as the legates of the Hungarian King Louis II, who, according to Francesco, are well informed about Ottoman progress in the Hungarian borders.³³ Many of these letters and orations were published³⁴, but none of them could compete with the popularity of Chiericati's speech, as the number of its editions suggests.

Francesco Chiericati was born to a noble family of Vicenza, who maintained a close connections with the Gonzagas, and worked as a papal diplomat; he was an efficient politician with something of a humanistic background.³⁵ He studied in Padua, Bologna and Siena, where he completed his studies of civil and ecclesiastical law. First in Siena, then in Rome, he was a protégé of various influential figures, including the archbishop of Salerno, Federico Fregoso (ca 1480–1541), Cardinal Sigismondo Gonzaga (1469–1525), Cardinal Matthäus Schiner (ca 1465–1522), Cardinal Adriano Castellesi (ca 1460–ca 1521) and Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (1478–1534; from 1523 Pope Clement VII). His personal network included the most interesting figures of the time, including Egidio da Viterbo (1469–1532), Paolo Giòvio (1483–1552) and Erasmus.

Chiericati participated in numerous diplomatic missions to England, Spain and Portugal, among other places. His most important political task was, however, connected to his participation in the Diet of Nuremberg, where he was sent to express the Pope's concerns about the 'Turkish threat' and the danger of the heresies spread by Luther.

³¹ Ibidem, B4r, C1r–C1v.

³² When writing about the danger of the Ottoman approach to the navigable rivers and the German borders, he adds: *Quod equidem sciam*: ibidem, B3v.

³³ Ibidem, B2r.

³⁴ Apart from the oration by Ladislaus de Macedonia see *inter alia*: Girolamo Balbi, *Oratio habita in Imperiali Conuentu Vuormacien Die tertia Aprilis. M.D.XXI. Per inclyti regis Hungariae et Bohemiae oratores*. [Augsburg: Silvan Otmar, 1521]; idem, *Oratio in Imperiali Conuentu Bormaciensi Coram diuo Carolo Caesare, ac principibus totius Imperii, die Tertia Aprilis. 1521...* [Vienna: Johann Singriener d.Ä., 1521]; Louis II, *Des Königs von Hungern sendprieß an Kayserlicher Statthalter vnd Regiment Zugesagter hilff gegen Türkischer Tyrannei merung [et]c. betreffende*, [Augsburg: Sigmund Grimm], (1523).

³⁵ For the most detailed biography of Chiericati see: A. Foa, 'Chiericati, Francesco', [in:] *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani*, vol. 24, Roma 1980, pp. 674–681. This entry serves as the main source for the passages on Chiericati's life in this paper.

The printed version of his *Oratio* opens with a dedication to Hungarian king Louis II and with a preface justifying the publication of his speech. In the dedicatory paragraphs Chiericati explains that the main aim of having his oration printed was so that those who had not listened to the speech presented at the Diet would have a chance to understand, through frequent reading of his work, what they needed to do in the current struggles of Christendom.³⁶ Then, addressing his words to Louis II, he says that the oration was given in order to help the Hungarian Kingdom, which is steadfastly defending itself against the wicked enemy.³⁷

The proper oration, which opens with the anecdote about Pericles, revolves around the concerns of the Pope about the condition of the Christian community and the alarming situation of the Hungarian Kingdom facing Ottoman aggression. The conflicts between monarchs could hamper fighting off the common threats: divisions within the universal Church and the Sultan's advances, claims the orator. The Pope has heard, says Chiericati, that Süleyman was so confident in his power and in the extent of his empire that he became unsatisfied with the dominion that had earlier belonged to his father – Asia, Greece, Illyria, Syria and Egypt – and had recently dared to invade the Hungarian Kingdom with its bulwark, Belgrade, and many other strongholds and towns.³⁸ Also in need were the island of Rhodes, which had recently come under siege by the Ottoman fleet, and the Illyrian town Senj which, for the sake of its own defense, needed military and food supplies.

It was the highest necessity of the situation that, as Chiericati claims, forced him to present his oration and to agree to its publication;³⁹ it was the peril and ruin threatening the whole of Christendom⁴⁰ that required funds to be raised for the Hungarian Kingdom. The oration consists of a few similar key phrases stressing the need of solidarity and pan-Christian action, which are repeated several times throughout the speech. The repetition of the crucial points, in the same or slightly changed form, is a feature characteristic for the pragmatics of successful communication and it was preserved in the printed version of the speech.⁴¹

Dialogue between a Turk, a Gypsy, a German hermit and a Hungarian

The dialogic form, on the other hand, was chosen by the author of the *Turcken puechlein*, a critical account of German foreign and inner affairs that interweaves

³⁶ The original Latin passage reads: [Q]uo illi qui me orantem non audiissent, possent ipsius saltem orationis frequenti lectione intelligere ea, quae sibi in praesenti Christianae reipublicae necessitate praestanda essent: Francesco Chiericati, *Francisci Chaeregati...* A2r: Whereas in the German translation the stress is put on the common aspect of overcoming threat against Christendom is even more clear [underlined by KM]: auff das die so much mündelich nit gehört mochten durche embsig lesen des selben vernemen **was zusammen** in gagenwerertiger **gemains nutz der christenhayt** not zu thyn sey: Francesco Chiericati, *Des pabstlichen rhedners potschaft...*, A2r.

³⁷ Francesco Chiericati, *Oratio habita Nurimbergae...*, A2r–A2v.

³⁸ Ibidem, B1r–B1v.

³⁹ Ibidem, A3v.

⁴⁰ Ibidem, B2r.

⁴¹ The features characteristic of oral communication are clearly reflected in the text by Chiericati: calling for the listeners' attention and addressing arguments in the second person plural. They point to the communication situation, that of listening to a monologue.

imperial politics with the realities of daily life in order to criticize the vices of current Christian society. The criticism is straightforwardly expressed by the protagonists, in the marginalia and in the opening verses. 'The Christians are worse than the Turks', indicates, for instance, the marginal note referring to the comparison of the Sultan's reign and the political system of his Empire with the Christian kingdoms, given by the Muslim protagonist of the *Turcken puechlein*.⁴²

The author of the dialogue, who uses the pseudonym *Philaethes*⁴³, takes advantage of the mimetic features of the genre. The protagonists exchange opinions on the Christian and Muslim empires in the conversation, and they refer to news they have heard from particular informers. The statements expressed by the main characters of the text reveal the author's good understanding of the situation on the borderland of Hungary, where the fictive conversation takes place.

The dialogue starts with a short description of the circumstances of the meeting of a German hermit, a Hungarian, a Turk and a Gypsy:

When the Turk roamed around Belgrade in the company of a Gypsy, he explored the neighbouring land of the Christians because the emperor of Constantinople wanted to invade them shortly using courageous forces with skillfulness and audacity.⁴⁴

The Turk and the Gypsy are spying together at the Hungarian borders shortly after the siege of Belgrade, and while wandering around they meet the Hungarian and the German hermit.

The protagonists are typified figures defined by a cluster of stereotypes. The hermit and the Hungarian are presented in a very positive light – they are brave and loyal to their countries. The Turk and Gypsy are characterized as cunning, untrustworthy and cruel. The graphic description of the protagonists fits well into the persuasive goals of the dialogue and the domestic agenda behind it. Similarly, the use of the vernacular, which possesses a larger mimetic potential than Latin, makes the text easily understandable. The context of the dialogue sheds further light on the pragmatic course of its message: the capacious slogan of a universal reformation and improvement of the ordinances.

All the information given by the author of the pamphlet on Ottomans is subordinated to the call for the religious and social renewal. Despite the strong pro-Reformation content, this *Flugschrift* is a treasury of the popular knowledge about the Ottoman Empire and about the habits of the Sultans' subjects. It is embedded in the long-standing tradition of the ethnographic descriptions of origins, social traditions and customs (*origo, mos, consuetudo*). Much attention is devoted to the discipline of 'the Turks', their religious conduct and social hierarchy. It is shown that Ottomans follow strict religious rules and are entirely dependent on the Sultan's decision and orders. The reader learns about the Ottomans' austere life style – sitting on the floor, moderate eating, abstention from alcohol – through comparison with the sumptuous habits of the Christians.

⁴² *Turcken puechlein*..., B2r.

⁴³ On the discussion on the authorship see: Balogh, *Eine Unterredung*..., pp. 34–36.

⁴⁴ Als der Turck umb Kriechischen Weissenburg hin und her weberte mit einem Zigeuner gelegenheit der anstossenden Christen land weiter zu erfahren damit sein Keiser von Constantinopel durch geeres krefften ynn kurtz mit geschicklichkeit vnd dapfferen ernst weiter darein sich dringen möchte: *Turcken puechlein*..., A3r.

Descriptions of Muslim social structures, customs and habits seek to answer the question: why did the Ottomans have an advantage over Christians? What should be improved in order to push the Ottoman army out of Europe? Detailed characteristics of the social structures, customs and internal problems of Germans, Hungarians, Venetians, Frenchmen, Englishmen, Greeks and other nations provide the reader with several answers. None of the social layers, the author suggests, are without responsibility for the current state of affairs. The protagonists demonstrate proof of the failings of the Pope and the other influential clerics, the emperor, the kings, governments, nobles, soldiers etc.

Interestingly, one of the subjects discussed by the Hungarian and the hermit regards which media would most effectively agitate people's hearts and minds in order to change the current, miserable state of affairs. The German discusses the usefulness of sermons and prints, and provides the reader with a list of beneficial titles, helpful authors and genres that should be read, all of which give hints about the corpus of influential texts on the Ottomans that were widely known in German-speaking territories during the pre-Mohács period.

The text mentions the book on the good king by Sebastian Brant (1457–1521), the oration by Louis Hélian (*fl.* ca 1510), and two further speeches delivered at the Diet of Augsburg in 1518, one by papal legate Thomas Cajetan (1469–1534) and a second by Erasmus Vitellius (1474–1522), known as Ciołek, bishop of Płock. Afterwards, the text mentions Ulrich von Hutten's (1488–1523) *Admonition to the German Princes* (*Ermahnung an die deutschen Fürsten*) – which was a response to two previous orations – along with the speech given by the Hungarian embassy at the Diet of Worms in 1521 and the poem by Jacob Locher Philomusus (1471–1528) published in 1521. The author concludes with 'many other books written to oppress the Turks'⁴⁵ leaving the list, in fact, open.

The short overview of the titles shows the variety of genres that employed the 'Turkish threat' for polemical purposes, and the role of German diets in addressing these matters and bringing them into the public discussion. The first book mentioned in the list is the text by Sebastian Brant, which is an exhortation to the fight against the Ottomans and to recapture the Holy Land, addressed to Emperor Maximilian I (1493–1519). Louis Hélian's *De bello suscipiendo aduersus Venetianos et Turcas Oratio* (*Oration on Waging the War against the Venetians and Turks*) is also addressed to Maximilian, who convened the Diet at Augsburg in 1510, at which this anti-Ottoman and anti-Venetian oration was presented in order to appeal to the German and French interests. Thomas Cajetan was advocating the Pope's plans for a crusade and asking for German support for this idea; Erasmus Vitellius's anti-Turkish oration was motivated by the interests of Polish king Sigismund I. Later on, the name of Ulrich von Hutten appears, who, apart from an exhortation against the Ottomans presented in a tone corresponding to the German interests of the time, was also one of the leading authors of the *Reformationsdialogen*.

⁴⁵ Doctor Sebastians Brant buch von den guten Königen, aus herr Ludwig Helian von Vertzel Oration (...) auch aus herrn Thomas Cardinaln zu Caiet und herrn Erasmus Vitelli Bischoffen zu Plocen Oration und herrn Ulrichen von Hutten Declamation alle drey ynn dem funffzehnhundertten und XVIII iar zu Augspurg gedruckt. Der gleichen aus der Hungarischen Botschafft zirlichen rede gegen dem Römischen Reiche zu Wormbs iüngst geübet und herrn Jacobs Lochers Philomuse Poetischen geticht ynn den funffzehnhundertten und xxi iar ausgangen auch viel andern büchern so die Turcken zuuerfolgen geschrieben sind: ibidem, G2v. Balogh identifies most of the titles: Balogh, *Eine Unterredung...*, pp. 101–102.

The list closes with the only lyrical work mentioned (most probably *Exhortatio heroica*)⁴⁶ by Jacob Locher, and the oration of the Hungarian legates warning the delegates present at the Diet in Worms in 1521 about the urgency of defending against the Ottoman army.

Hungarian legates at the imperial diets

The majority of titles mentioned in the anonymous dialogue refer to orations presented at the Imperial Diets in Augsburg or Worms, and show the importance of this assembly for the transfer of news on 'the Turkish' matter.⁴⁷ The diets were a platform for the spokesmen of different political agents to spread information on the Sultan's advances and to negotiate their anti-Ottoman policy. The diets brought together an audience of the powerful who could potentially act against the Ottomans, as well as orators equipped with rhetorical skills, interested in evoking their response, as was the case in the proceedings of 19 November 1522.

The schedule of the November proceedings was focused exclusively on the Ottoman issue; they included the analyzed speech of the papal legate, followed by the oration of the Hungarian spokesman, and then orations from the Bohemian and Polish representatives, which were not preserved in printed form.⁴⁸ The discussion about what action should be undertaken against the Ottoman army was continued with the arrival of archduke Ferdinand on 2 December, when the Hungarian as well as the Croatian and Bosnian legates were asked numerous questions concerning the current state of affairs.⁴⁹ The next day, the Diet issued its rather restrained response to the Hungarian pleas, which was followed by a similar one three days later.⁵⁰ Military promises of a more concrete nature were given on 9 December, however the range of offered help was disappointing to Ladislaus de Macedonia and his colleagues.⁵¹ Chiericati's speech, given on 15 December, did not improve the situation and the new decisions presented 15 and 19 December also failed to meet Hungarian expectations.⁵² One week later the delegates left Nuremberg, dismayed by the final answer from the Diet's representatives.⁵³

It seems that shortly after the presentation of a speech it appeared in printed form. It is hard to say when exactly and by whom Chiericati's and Ladislaus' orations were first issued, but it is known that, as early as 28 November, Chiericati had already sent his printed *Oratio* to Italy.⁵⁴ It is possible that Ladislaus de Macedonia followed his example

⁴⁶ Balogh, *Eine Unterredung...*, p. 102, note 80.

⁴⁷ The media and functions of 'the Turkish orations' presented at the Diet of Augsburg are discussed by: L. Rüger, 'Der Augsburger Reichstag von 1518 – ein Höhepunkt politischer Oratorik?', [in:] J. Feuchter, J. Helmuth (eds.), *Politische Redekultur in der Vormoderne: die Oratorik europäischer Parlamente in Spätmittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, Frankfurt am Main 2008, pp. 65–84.

⁴⁸ *Deutsche Reichstagsakten...*, vol. 3, pp. 319–320.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 320, 329–330.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 331–333, 225–337.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, pp. 337–338.

⁵² *Ibidem*, pp. 338–354.

⁵³ *Ibidem*, p. 320.

⁵⁴ The letter was addressed to his patron and friend, marchioness of Mantua Isabella d'Este (1474–1539): *ibidem*, p. 321, note 2.

and handed the text of his talk directly to one of the German printers before his return to Hungary, but this remains mere conjecture.

Such quick publication was possible due to the fact that the foreign legates brought with them to the diets well-composed written accounts, which were aimed to be read out in the presence of lay and clerical authorities: electors, princes and representatives of the estates. The presented speeches were written and refined in advance.⁵⁵ Initially, the transfer of information took part between the orators and the audience present at the diet. Thanks to the printers, the issues discussed in the diets – that is, the political centers of the Empire – were subsequently made public and received attention in the cultural and economical centers of the Empire, that is the towns. The diets, therefore, constituted the first environment in which the Ottoman issues were raised as important political matters, but it was *Flugschriften* that actively participated in spreading the message and broadening the audience.

Communication channels

The broadening of the audience involved a change of the medium and, in some cases, also change of language. The orations by Ladislaus de Macedonia and Francesco Chiericati, and the other speeches to which the author of *Turcken puechlein* alludes, were originally delivered in Latin, a language of diplomacy which was justified by its prestige, its cultural connotations and a ubiquitous comprehension among the elites of the time.⁵⁶ The texts of orations were then simultaneously disseminated in both Latin- and German-language versions by the *Flugschriften*. Thanks to a wide circulation, the lack of real involvement from the diets' participants did not stop the transmission of the orators' message to the German-speaking audience.

The validity of the witnesses' accounts of the Ottoman advance to the Hungarian borders was recognized by the local readership. The proof of the trust put in this Hungarian first-hand experience may be seen in *Turcken puechlein*. Throughout the dialogue, Hungarians and Croats are shown as informers about the organization of the Ottoman Empire. It is the Hungarian protagonist, who, to prove the trustworthiness of his statements about the Ottomans, says: 'This I heard from those of ours who had been held captive in Turkey'.⁵⁷ In the fictive conversation, Croats are also presented as a trustworthy source of information. The German hermit, when deliberating about the Ottoman Empire, adds 'as I learnt from a Croat, who was by you Turks long kept imprisoned'.⁵⁸

The information from the Hungarian legates was spread in German-speaking cities, which were the focal points of all communication channels – supra-regional and local,

⁵⁵ T. Haye, 'Die lateinische Sprache als Medium mündlicher Diplomatie', [in:] R.C. Schwinges, K. Wriedt (eds.), *Gesandtschafts- und Botenwesen im spätmittelalterlichen Europa*, Thorbecke 2003, pp. 22–24.

⁵⁶ Ibidem, pp. 19–22.

⁵⁷ Hunger: 'Denn ich von den unsern so ynn der Turkey etwan gefangen gewest... gehört': *Turcken puechlein*..., C3v.

⁵⁸ Einsidel: 'als ich von einem Crabaten der lang bey euch Turcken gefenglich enthalten gewest vernommen hab': ibidem, B2r. In turn, Christian fugitives are presented as the informers of the Sultan.

oral and written, learned and common.⁵⁹ These were the cities that provided the environment in which *Flugschriften*, and texts they contained, were manufactured and read.

The colophon of the *Flugschrift* with the German translation of Ladislaus' oration, which reads: 'printed in the imperial town of Augsburg by doctor Sigmund Grymm',⁶⁰ contains a lot of information: it denotes the town in which the booklet was printed, its free imperial city status, as well as the name of the printer along with his social distinction. Such detailed information was not provided by the other *Flugschriften* discussed here. However, typographical and historical research enables one to attribute most of them to printers working in and for vibrant urban centers of the Holy Roman Empire such as Augsburg, Erfurt, Nuremberg and Strasbourg; or in Basel, the civic center of the Swiss Confederacy.⁶¹

The status of free city or that of an important academic center guaranteed favorable conditions not only for the printing business but also for intellectual activity. Anthony Grafton has portrayed the role of this connection in the life of the early modern intellectual elites – men of letters – and points out that an efficient printing market 'gave men and women of letters their only power – publicity'⁶², which also assured a favorable economic and intellectual background for those printers with humanistic pretensions such as Sigmund Grimm (died ca 1532) or Valentin Curio (ca 1500–ca 1532).⁶³

The biographies of those involved in the production of *Flugschriften* informing about the Ottomans suggest that printing was among the activities which civic intellectuals found suitable to their aspirations and academic education. The printers mentioned above were interested in disseminating *Flugschriften* reporting on the Ottomans'

⁵⁹ T.A. Brandy Jr., 'The reformation of the common man, 1521–1524', [in:] C.S. Dixon (ed.), *The German Reformation*, Oxford 1999, pp. 95–96.

⁶⁰ Gedruckt in der khaiserlichen stat Augspurg; Ladislaus de Macedonia, *Die hungerisch botschaft...*, C3v.

⁶¹ According to VD 16 the *Flugschriften* under consideration could be attributed to the Augsburg printers: Sigmund Grimm working alone or with the company of Marx Wirsung (died after 1522), Jörg Nadler (fl. 1508–1525) and the heirs of Erhard Oeglin (working ca 1522). Some of the discussed *Flugschriften* were identified as the products of the Basel printing houses of Valentin Curio (ca 1500–ca 1532) and Adam Petri (1454–1527), the Erfurt printing house of Matthes Maler (died 1536), the one in Nuremberg of Friedrich Peypus (ca 1485–1535) and finally the one of the Strasbourg printer Johann Prüß the younger (fl. 1511–1546). Among these towns, only Erfurt was not granted the privilege of a free imperial city (Basel has this status before joining the Swiss Confederacy in 1501) but, as an important academic center, it had great intellectual and cultural resources at its disposal.

⁶² A. Grafton, *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West*, Cambridge (Mass.) 2009, p. 19.

⁶³ Sigmund Grimm, before starting the printing business (ca 1517–1527), was a town physician and owner of a pharmacy (1507–1516). He studied in Freiburg in Breisgau and received the title of doctor of medicine. Around a year after establishing his printing house in 1518, he started a four-year collaboration with a rich merchant, Marx Wirsung, who sympathised with the teachings of Luther. His printing house was famous for publishing elegant books and musical prints as well as numerous reformation prints. Grimm's intellectual aspirations led him to alchemy as well as to attempts to publish the works of Petrarch and Cicero: J. Benzing, *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet*, Wiesbaden 1982, p. 16; E. Kelchner, 'Grimm, Siegmund', [in:] *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 9, Leipzig 1879, p. 690.

The biography of Valentin Curio provides another example of a local intellectual devoted to the printing enterprise. He studied in Basel and then between 1521 and 1532 worked there as a printer. His printing house published numerous Latin- and Greek-language texts belonging to the corpus of the *Artes Liberales*. Among authors whose works he published were the contemporary humanists such as Jakob Ceporin (1499–1525), reformers like Luther and Philipp Melancthon (1497–1560) as well as classical authorities such as Strabo, Lucian, Horace: V. Feller-Vest, 'Curio, Valentin', [in:] *Historisches Lexikon der Schweiz*, online version [access 03.12.2012], <http://www.hls-dhs-dss.ch/textes/d/D29171.php>.

advance to the Hungarian frontier, in addition to respectable classical literature. They manufactured pamphlets corresponding to the needs of the time, along with humanistic literature that should always be of intellectual and moral value.⁶⁴

The simultaneous publication in different urban centers of the same text regarding the Ottomans suggests, on the one hand, a general interest in information about the Sultan's subjects and, on the other, the local scale of production of these pamphlets.⁶⁵ Moreover, the local language variants traceable in the different editions and variants of *Flugschriften* indicate dissimilarities in linguistic specificity and expectations of the readership in a particular region, which the printers attempted to meet.

Latin original and vernacular translations

Providing the reader with vernacular versions of Latin texts was one of the ways in which printers met the expectations of their varied target groups. Two out of the three texts analyzed in this paper were originally given in Latin and, soon after they had been printed, were translated into German. The speech of Ladislaus de Macedonia was written in the Ciceronian fashion, and the elegant Latin of Chiericati was additionally embellished with erudite comparisons and humanistic *topoi*. Most of the German-speaking elites, who were the addressee mentioned in the apostrophes of these orations, were fluent in Latin and were able to appreciate the refinement of the speeches.

The fact that both language versions were functioning at the same time suggests that the printers had a 'composite audience' in mind or addressed them, to use the term by Maximilian Lanzinner, to different segments of public opinion: courts, estates and governments; the Church and theologians; towns and burghers; universities and intellectuals.⁶⁶ Further clues about the target groups may be provided by evidence such as the marginalia.

The printed editions of German translations of Francesco Chiericati's speech and the editions of *Turcken puechlein* help the reader follow the content and quickly find the relevant passages of the texts when needed. Similarly the editions of *Turcken puechlein* have a useful system of guiding the reader, indicating the most important points of the text.⁶⁷ The German edition of Ladislaus' oration, although more complicated, also

⁶⁴ Although scholars have repeated such suppositions (Cf. Schwitalla, *Flugschrift*, p. 25), the printers of the *Flugschriften* did not necessarily specialise exclusively in this type of publications. Similarly, they did not limit themselves to printing works either in vernacular or in the (neo)classical languages. On the contrary, many of them wished to offer their works to the widest possible cultural spectrum.

⁶⁵ The second point might be explained by the high shipping costs and the copyright policies which did not yet function well at the time.

⁶⁶ M. Lanzinner, 'Kommunikationsraum Region und Reich', [in:] J. Burkhardt, Ch. Werkstetter (eds.), *Kommunikation und Medien in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Munich 2005, p. 232.

⁶⁷ On the outer margin of *Des pabstlichen Rhedners Potschaft Francisci Cheregati* one can find such keywords for understanding the context of the oration as: *Rhodis, Ungarisch potschafft, Hungern von theutschen zu rhetten, Pabstlich gewerb hungern zu rhetten* etc. Also *Turcken puechlein* follows this pattern. The reader of the text was guided by the following marginalia: *Des Bapst untrew, Christen böser denn Turcken, Man solt nicht wein trincken* etc. The reading was also facilitated by the use of a language register which was close to the daily habits of quotidian communication. The author of *Turcken puechlein* appropriated popular phrases and colloquial sayings and used the German version of proper names.

suggests a the pragmatic character of his text.⁶⁸ Whereas marginalia in the German-language editions guided readers through the texts, the Latin-language versions, which signaled the names of rhetorical figures used by the authors and the structural parts of the speeches in the margins, draw attention to the exemplary composition of the speech. The latter are not pragmatic annotations which help one to understand the content of the oration, but rather indicators of the eloquence and rhetoric skills of the author.

Serving different target groups, the Latin- and German- language versions of the texts performed different functions. Latin was an indispensable means of displaying and advancing one's status within a circle of first-class intellectuals. Nonetheless, it is unknown in which language Erasmus of Rotterdam read the oration by Chiericati, 'which' – as he writes in his letter to the papal legate – 'has reached us here in print'⁶⁹.

If Erasmus had the *Oratio* in his hand, many other recognized Basel intellectuals most probably had had the chance to read it as well. While we have a letter from Erasmus confirming his appreciation of Chiericati's speech, we presumably lack dozens of other letters and word-of-mouth accounts praising his work and the opportunity to become familiar with its Ottoman content, spread by these wide intellectual networks.

Flugschriften took advantage of the spoken word.⁷⁰ They bound together features characteristic of oral communication (such as dialogical forms, traces of the performative aspect of the oration, and emotive expressions) with those typical for written utterance (such as, for instance, lengthy dedications, lemma etc.). They were designed in a way that facilitated the oral transmission of their message. As the predecessor of modern mass media, they made use of habitual communication channels such as word-of-mouth. To repeat after A. Pettegree:

Even if one could not read or understand the messages they contained, the *Flugschriften* represented a means of sharing a public excitement that one had first become aware of through the pulpit preaching, or the gossip on the street. But purchase might also be the first step in a process of personal involvement that led eventually to commitment.⁷¹

The commitment and participation in sharing the responsibility for the common fate is stressed in all the analyzed prints in order to increase communal solidarity. In the very local civic landscape, it could be understood as an attempt to consolidate the local communities. The 'Turkish threat' had proven itself well in this role.

⁶⁸ The Latin versions of Ladislaus' speech indicate the lines which open particular rethorical parts of his speech by printing on the outer margins such technical terms as: *proemium*, *narratio*, *divisio*, *confirmatio*, *contrarium exemplum*, *epilogus primus*, *exclamatio*, *conduplicatio* etc. (See appendix no 3.) The marginalia in the German version selectively indicate the rhetorical structure of the speech and point to quotes from the Bible and from Caesar's *De bello Gallico* (which were obvious for the erudite readers). Additionally they give the key terms referring to the content of the particular paragraphs. The German version of Ladislaus' oration was not preceded by the lemma entitled *Aquila ad viatorem* (as was the case in both Latin-language editions) nor by the coat of arms (as in the elegant Nuremberg edition).

⁶⁹ Desiderius Erasmus, *The Correspondence of Erasmus*, R.A.B. Mynors, D.F.S. Thomson (trans.), W.K. Ferguson (annot.), Toronto–London 1974–, vol. 9, p. 278.

⁷⁰ Cf. B.-M. Schuster, *Die Verständlichkeit von frühreformatorischen Flugschriften. Eine Studie zu kommunikationswirksamen Faktoren der Textgestaltung*, Hildesheim 2001, pp. 17–22, 265–272.

⁷¹ A. Pettegree, *Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion*, p. 170. Cf. R.W. Scribner, *Popular Culture and Popular Movements in Reformation Germany*, London 1987, pp. 50–51.

Conclusions

The Ottomans' advance to the Hungarian borderlands was an important subject of information traffic in the pre-Mohács period, which was, itself, a significant '*Flugschrift* moment'. Pamphlets were produced in hundreds of copies and they reached the widest readership one could have imagined in the sixteenth century. By virtue of the *Flugschriften*, news of Süleyman's advances reached the hands of both the most erudite and less-educated readers, causing a political, social and/or religious resonance. The context in which the image of the Ottomans was drawn – a summons to a common crusade (Ladislaus de Macedonia, Francesco Chiericati), an anti-Lutheran discussion (Francesco Chiericati) and an exhortation for social and religious reformations (*Philalethes*) – reshaped that image among the broad readership.

The representation of the Ottomans constructed by Ladislaus de Macedonia, Francesco Chiericati and *Philalethes* – even if presented with a certain approval, as in the case of the last author – was unambiguous and aimed to provoke a similarly unambiguous response. The dissemination of an image presenting a common military, religious and social foe also had consequences for the formation of an identity among the Hungarian- and German-speaking subjects of the Holy Roman Emperor. Information traffic about the Ottomans' advance established a clear differentiation of roles. *Turcken buechlein*, with its distinctively portrayed protagonists, is both a product and a further disseminator of fixed models. The orations by the papal and royal legates, in turn, offer an insight into the political and social space in which the new self-identification of nobles, burghers, intellectuals etc. were being negotiated. All three *Flugschriften* demonstrate the way in which intercultural communication could foster processes leading to a consolidation of the identity models of its participants.

Most of the participants within the communication processes concerning the Ottomans were members of the imperiled communities, shaken by the military campaign of the Sultan (Hungarian subjects, Vatican See), or by radical social and religious changes (Holy Roman Empire, the Swiss Confederation, Vatican See). They were eagerly using the *Flugschriften* as an effective channel for disseminating their concerns and proposing concrete military solutions. The trustworthiness of this information channel was of great importance. It was established by the authority of the author, and by the references to the sources of information: an eyewitness account, official letters, or the mention of unprofessional informers such as former Ottoman captives. Oral communication seems to have had a privileged place among the sources, and first-hand accounts from the border-zone were of the greatest credibility. Therefore, the transfer of information regarding the Ottoman advance is characterised by a complex interplay between the oral message (word-of-mouth of the witnesses from the contact-zones, oration delivered in the Diet), the written text (letters, drafts of the orations) and the printed word (texts fixed in the form of *Flugschriften*).

Apart from listing different media, the selection of the *Flugschriften* examined here enables one to reflect on the agents involved: authors (and their patrons), translators, printers and their customers (commissioners and/or readers). The first were well educated and informed intellectuals, who often were appointed spokesmen by important political figures of the time. The second are unknown by name but, by rendering the orations of Ladislaus de Macedonia and Francesco Chiericati into the vernacular, they

contributed to the broadening of the readership. The last participants in the process – printers and their customers – were closely interrelated as the *Flugschriften* were manufactured according to the expectations and habits of the clients. Similarly both printers and their customers participated in the further dissemination of the prints.

The 'flying prints' on the Ottomans' advance to the Hungarian border were designed in such a way that was possible for them to circulate as up-to-date accounts among members of the international political arena and the *res publica litteraria*, as well as among German-speaking burghers. Educated and sophisticated audiences appreciated good literature, and admired the style of the authors, the crafty construction of their argumentation and the flow of their language; the more pragmatically-minded burghers, on the other hand, received insight into the imperial politics on which the prosperity of their home town depended and which guaranteed the very existence of the urban areas. The numerous re-editions and variants of the discussed prints suggest that there was a great demand for such pamphlets on the part of the readers and on the part of the commissioners, who recognized the propaganda potential of the medium. *Flugschriften* were therefore a profitable business, but also enabled printers to take part in discussions on the matters important to their communities. Similarly, the authors of the texts were fulfilling a public mission, promoting themselves and, at the same time, strengthening their position on the intellectual scene. The brochures recording accounts of the Sultan's armies' march to the Hungarian borderlands were beneficial for many agents – for those who fought the Ottomans with the sword on the battlefields, or fought for a common reformation with words, but also for those writing for the sake of their own diplomatic or literary career.

Appendices

1. Selection of sources

My selection of pre-Mohács *Flugschriften* is based on three main criteria: 1) they were printed in different civic centers of the German-speaking areas; 2) they offered an insight into the Hungarian context of the 'Turkish threat' after the fall of Belgrade; 3) they were widely known prints, whose popularity could be justified by the number of translations, editions and variants.

Choice of the materials did not therefore include several important and influential prints such as letters by Louis II (*Des Königs von Hungern sendprieß an Kayserlich Statthalter vnd Regiment Zugesagter hilff gegen Türkischer Tyrannei merung [et]c. betreffende*. [Augsburg: Sigmund Grimm], (1523); Oration of Bernardinus de Frangepanibus (*Oratio pro Croatia, Nürenbergae in Senatu Principum Germaniae habita XIIj. Cal. Decemb. An. Ch. M. D.XXij*, printed in Nuremberg in 1522 by Friedrich Peypus); or letters by Adrian VI (*Eym Bapstlich breue oder sendbrieß des Bapsts Adriani...*, [Straßburg: Johann Knobloch d.Ä. 1523]).

Quotations from the original works are based on the editions that: 1) could be considered to be *editio princeps*; 2) disseminated an accurate version of the text; 3) were available, in their original form, to the author of this paper. Following these three criteria, I decided to use the Nuremberg edition of Ladislaus' oration (VD16 M 20) and (the only) Augsburg edition of the translation of his work (VD16 ZV 10219). For Francesco

Chiericati's oration, I refer to the Augsburg edition of the original (VD16 C 2235) and the Augsburg edition of the translation (VD16 C 2239). Finally, from numerous editions of *Turcken puechlein*, I quote the Basel edition of the dialogue (VD16 T 2235).

If there is no striking difference between the original version of the text and its translation, only excerpts from the original language-version are provided. As I am interested in the original (and material) forms in which the analyzed texts functioned in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, I am not quoting the textual versions available in the contemporary editions of Ladislaus' oration (Ladislaus of Macedonia, *Orationes*, I.K. Horváth (eds.), Szeged 1964) and the German-Hungarian edition of *Turcken puechlein* (which based on the edition of 1527: A.F. Balogh, *Eine Unterredung gegen die Türken: zweisprachige kommentierte Edition der deutschen Flugschrift VD 16:T2239*, Budapest 2003).

2. List of printers and printing houses (attributions given after VD 16)

Augsburg : Sigmund Grimm
 Augsburg: Sigmund Grimm and Marx Wirsung
 Augsburg: Jörg Nadler
 Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin (heirs)
 Basel: Valentin Curio
 Basel: Adam Petri
 Erfurt: Matthes Maler
 Nuremberg: Friedrich Peypus
 Strasbourg: Johann Prüß the younger

3. Comparision of marginalia in the three editions of the *Oratio* by Ladislaus de Macedonia

Nuremberg Latin version (VD16 M 20)	Phrase	Augsburg Latin version (VD16 M 19)	Phrase	Augsburg German version (VD16 ZV 10219)	Phrase
f. B1r	Proemium	f. B1v	Proemium	–	–
f. B1v	Narratio	f. B2r	Narratio	–	–
f. B1v	Divisio	f. B2v	Divisio	f. A4v	Thailung
f. B1v	Confirmatio i	f. B2v	Confirmatio 1	f. A4v	Beuestigung
f. B2v	Contrarium exemplum	f. B3v	Contrarium exemplum	f. B2r	Widerwartig gleichnus
f. B2v	Epilogus i	f. B4r	Epilogus primus	f. B2r	Beschlus rhed 1.
f. B3r	Confirmatio ii	f. B4r	Confirmatio 2	f. B2r	Befestigung 2
–	–	–	–	f. B2v	Mar. 8
–	–	–	–	f. B2v	1. Pe. 4.
–	–	–	–	f. B2v	Mat. 25
–	–	–	–	f. C1r	1. Cor. 6.
–	–	–	–	f. C1r	con.ces.li 3

f. B3v	Exclamatio	f. B4v	Exclamatio	f. C1r	Ausschreibung
f. B4r	Epilogus 2	f. C1v	Epilogus 2	f. C1v	Beschlus rhed 2
f. B4r	Transitio	f. C1v	Transitio	–	–
f. B4r	Confirmatio iii	f. C1v	Confirmatio iii	f. C1v	Befestigung 3
f. B4r	Articulus	f. C1v	Articulus	–	–
–	–	–	–	f. C2r	Rom. 8.
f. B4r	Repetitio et dissolutum	f. C1v	Repetitio et dissolutum	–	–
f. B4v	Confutatio i	f. C2r	Confutatio 1	f. C2r	Verwerffung i
f. B4v	Conduplicatio	f. C2r	Conduplicatio		
f. B4v	Ii	f. C2v	ii	f. C2v	2
f. B4v	Iii	f. C2v	iii	f. C3r	3
f. C1r	Iiii	f. C2v	iiii	f. C3r	4
f. C1r	Epilogus	f. C3r	Epilogus	f. C3r	Beschlus rhed 3
–	–	–	–	f. C3r	li. 2. 5. 29
f. C1r	Antiteton et dissolutum	f. C3r	Antiteton et dissolutum	–	–
f. C1r	Conclusio	f. C3r	Conclusio	f. C3v	Beschlus
f. C1r	Metalepsis	f. C3r	Metalepsis	–	–